

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

March 15, 2007

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Dennis Cope, Robert Hall, Lee Madrid, David Scott Meade, Sally Promer-Nichols, Mery Velastegui

STAFF PRESENT: Judd Black, Development Review Manager; Steven Fischer, Senior Planner; Asma Jeelani, Assistant Planner; Amy Keenan, Associate Planner; Gary Lee, Senior Planner; Nathalie Schmidt, Assistant Planner

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson of the Design Review Board Sally Promer-Nichols at 7:00 PM. Design Review Board member David Wobker was excused.

APPROVAL

DEV070029, R.A. Building/Hwang's Taekwondo

Description: Exterior remodel including removal of stucco and installation of siding

Location: 18210 Redmond Way

Applicant: Sun Hwang

Staff Contact: Asma Jeelani / 425.556.2443

Asma Jeelani, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report, explaining that the existing stucco would be removed and replaced with hardi-plank siding and commenting that staff would prefer that the exterior color of the building be a lighter earthtone instead of the proposed pink.

Bill Zbitnoff, 18210 Redmond Way, Redmond, WA, explained that the applicant wanted a similar color. The largest building next to this building is red, white and blue and has red and blue neon lighting. There is a forest behind this building, and it is important to try to blend into that. The applicant had an alternate color, cinnamon whip, for the building with ivory on the windows. The intent was to make minimal changes to the building and repair the structural damage. The stucco had been 60% removed. The existing windows would be bronze, the window trim white, and the balcony railings black. The applicant would be willing to do the railings in white. He confirmed for the Board that there would be 6-inch-wide wood trim around the windows. There would be a 12-inch, creamy white, wood cornice on top of the building and also corner trim.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Madrid:

- Confirmed that the existing front door would remain the same.
- Was not sold on the cinnamon whip color, although the color family was fine.
- Noted that the apartment building across the street has very nice warm colors.
- Preferred changing the railings to the white color and to make the building color warm—maybe the chutney brown on the color palette.

Ms. Velastegui:

- Confirmed that the building was stucco up and down. She suggested making a base to the building by painting a different color. (Mr. Zbitnoff said there would be siding all the way up and down and did not think that painting a different color for a base would work.)
- Confirmed that the entry would be the same.
- Suggested using darker color instead of white for the trim—a bronze, brown or black.

Mr. Meade:

- Commented that 12-inch trim on the top would not work. Should pick up full dimension and wrap the cornice all the way around the building. Have one big cornice. Might take a couple of pieces of wood to get the desired width.
- Should use dark colors in the recesses to give depth.
- Thought they should shrink the trim down to 2.5-3 inches, pick a color close to the bronze window frame, and leave the rails black. This would make the building look like a commercial one. Six-inch trim looks more like a residential building.
- Recommended refining the design.
- Said he would accept the colors in the palette the applicant preferred.
- Suggested that they render up the design.
- Thought it might be a good idea to create a base or create a bellyband across the top of the windows to get a base, middle and top for a tripartite effect.

The applicant agreed to a combination of chutney brown and a lighter color for the majority of the building, a dark color for the recesses that would match the trim to the bronze, keep the black railing the same, and go to the 3-inch trim.

(Mr. Hall arrived at 7:20 PM.)

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MEADE AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO APPROVE DEV070029, R.A. BUILDING/HWANG'S TAEKWONDO, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- **THE TWO BODY COLORS SHOULD BE: THE MAIN BODY COLOR, CHUTNEY BROWN, AND THE SECONDARY BODY COLOR, BROWN THRUSH; THE RAIL COLOR BLACK; THE WINDOW TRIMS TO BE 1X3 AND PAINTED TO MATCH THE DARK BRONZE COLOR OF THE WINDOW FRAMES, AND THE FLASHING SHOULD ALSO BE IN THE DARK BRONZE COLOR.**
- **THE DIMENSION OF THE CORNICE SHOULD MATCH THE OVERHANG OF THE ROOF CANTILEVER, WHICH IS APPROXIMATELY TWO FEET IN DEPTH.**
- **THE MAIN BODY SHOULD BE IN HARDI-PANEL IN TWO-FOOT DEEP SWATH.**

MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

APPROVAL

PRE060046 and L060508, Grass Lawn Phase 3

Description: Renovate an existing three-acre portion of the southeast corner of the park and construct a pavilion and a park maintenance building

Location: 7031 148th Ave NE / Old Redmond Road

Architect: Wayne Ivary with Ivary & Associates

Landscape Architect: Bruce Dees with Bruce Dees & Associates

Applicant: Tim Cox with City of Redmond Parks Department

Prior Review Date: July 20, 2006 and January 4, 2007

Staff Contact: Amy Keenan / 425.556.2407

Amy Keenan, Associate Planner, presented the staff report, explaining that the applicant had submitted detailed landscape plans depicting the area surrounding the new pavilion, the rain garden bordering 148th Avenue NE, the northeast entrance corner and the green roof for the maintenance building, as well as a representative plant list, details of the bouldering area, benches, and fencing details adjacent to the maintenance building.

Tim Cox, Parks Department, presented the design due to the absence of the architect and landscape architect. He explained that Grass Lawn is the most heavily-used public park. The proposed landscaping

is beautiful and, hopefully, vigorous and hardy. There would be relatively subtle lighting because the location is immediately adjacent to a large sports field with abundant lighting. The green roof is proposed to be flat, and the landscape architect is exploring to find the best material related to maintenance and survivability. He showed pictures of the bouldering area that would have real rocks designed by rock climbers to have easy, medium and hard sides that are well designed and thought out, and will be integrated into the landscape area. The site development details page showed the curbing for the paths, which would be conventional curbing, and there would be pervious asphalt for the trails that go through the park.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Emphasized that she could not buy putting more ivy in this park. One of the problems with ivy being a noxious plant is that it travels. To be stewards of the landscape, all ivy already in the park should be taken out and replaced with something else, such as vincas, or rubras under the trees. (Mr. Cox responded that it would not be an issue not to plant any more ivy, and there are already plans to remove some of the existing ivy on the frontage along 148th Avenue NE.)

Mr. Cope:

- Thought they had done a good job.
- Commented that on L1.4, Landscape Drawing, Enlargement D, what was going on in the drawing was in conflict. (Mr. Cox explained that there was a cell tower, but the City had that day made the decision not to renew that lease so the fence around the light pole with the cellular antenna attached would be removed.)
- Inquired why a fence was needed for the maintenance building. (Mr. Cox explained that the fence was needed because otherwise people could break in and because equipment would be left outside. This was primarily a security issue, but also to screen equipment from view.)

Mr. Madrid:

- Confirmed that the antenna would be removed off the top of the sports lighting.
- Was concerned about the way the ground cover under the play equipment would age. (Mr. Cox answered that the Operations people had made certain they bought the best, safest and nicest-looking material available.)

Mr. Meade:

- Pointed out that #2 on sheet 3 had Simpson 4x6 column bases but 6x6 posts.
- Was interested in seeing what plants they decided upon for the roof. He liked sedums.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. PROMER-NICHOLS AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO APPROVE PRE060046 AND L060508, GRASS LAWN PHASE 3, LANDSCAPE PLAN AND ASSOCIATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- **STAFF-RECOMMENDED STANDARD CONDITION REGARDING PRESENTATION MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES.**
- **APPLICANT MUST FIND AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE USE OF ENGLISH IVY.**
- **ON PLAN L1.4, THERE WOULD BE NO FENCING AROUND THE LIGHT POLE THAT HAD THE CELLULAR ANTENNA ON IT.**

MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

APPROVAL – OF OUTSTANDING ITEMS

PRE060006 and L060503, River Park Mixed-Use Project

Description: 316 housing units; 145-room hotel; 108,593-square foot office; and 18,800-square foot retail

Location: 7805 159th PI NE

Architect: Bob Tiscareno with Tiscareno Associates

Landscape Architect: Kris Snider with Hewitt Architects

Applicant: Darcy Garneau with Legacy Partners

Prior Review Dates: February 2, May 4, July 6, August 3, 2006 and January 4, 2007

Staff Contact: Gary Lee / 425.556.2418

Gary Lee, Senior Planner, presented the staff report for the sixth review of this project. He explained that the 3-Star Green Built rating is not a City requirement. Staff is recommending the 3-Star rating because the Green Built standards will be going to a 5-Star rating within the year. This is a tradeoff for the design standard deviations.

Mr. Cope thought this a good idea because this gives staff something against which to measure the project for being exemplary. He inquired how compliance to this standard would be monitored as the project moves along and what would happen if conformance were not met.

Judd Black, Development Review Manager, responded that the applicant could work with the Building Department as they go through the process to make sure the applicant is complying with what they are agreeing to do under the site list. Staff could meet with them on a regular basis to make sure they are matching the condition.

Darcy Garneau, Legacy Partners, 7528 SE 78th, #180, Mercer Island, WA 98040, reported that the office building and parking garage are in for permitting now and the other buildings would follow shortly.

Scott Mackay, Legacy Partners, Project Manager, 1300 NE 68th Street, Seattle, WA 98115, went over the list of issues and responses from the applicant with assistance from the design team.

Kris Snyder, Hewitt Architects, described the landscape concept, explaining that there would be three nice water features—one at the entrance on River Park Drive, another one at the joining point of Lagoon Lane and River Park Drive, and the third at the end of Lagoon Lane at the step-down to the park. There would be Honey Locust trees, ferns, evergreen shrubs and grasses along 159th Place NE and the future extension of Bear Creek Parkway. There would not be a lot of formality to the landscape plan, but mostly is meant to be connective.

For the office building, Mark Ludtka with Callison explained that they had broken up the penthouse with some verticals. They had found some very good examples in Redmond.

For the hotel, Jeff Krahbiel with Jeff Krahbiel Associated reported that they had added more light and detail on the end of the building that faced 159th Place NE. They changed the area where the mechanical units are located and moved the transformer around the corner. They changed the ramp and stair systems to make the relocation of the transformer work. The whole end element is very similar to what they have on the park end of the building with the balconies and the way the first floor is broken up.

Regarding the green issues, the applicant claimed to have exceeded the requirements for a 3-Star Green Built rating.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Madrid:

- Confirmed that Building E on the black-and-white drawing is more what they are heading toward rather than what was shown on the conceptual drawing. (The applicant noted that they are thinking of adding a pea-patch to the courtyard of Building E.)

Ms. Velastegui:

- Noted that they had added some windows to the blank wall on the east elevation of the hotel.
- Liked the improvements to the hotel design.
- Liked the colors and the different materials.
- Loved the idea of the base.

Mr. Meade:

- Inquired what material would be used for the retaining walls. (The applicant representative responded that they would be made of loose lag. The primary purpose for the berm is to have a place for the trees.)
- Commented that he thought the hotel had turned out to be gorgeous.
- Thought the landscape looked excellent.

- Thought the plaza near Building D along 159th Place NE was adequate and did not need to be revised with 300 additional square feet.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Agreed with Mr. Meade about the hotel and thanked the applicant for working with staff and the Design Review Board on the outstanding issues.
- Liked very much the pool deck in the back of the hotel because it provides an interface between the hotel and the park—one more layer of softening the edge.
- Thanked the applicant for doing the green techniques as requested by City staff.
- Thought the plaza near Building D along 159th Place NE was adequate and did not need to be revised with 300 additional square feet.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO APPROVE PRE060006 AND L060503, RIVER PARK MIXED-USE PROJECT, OUTSTANDING ISSUES WITHOUT THE STAFF-RECOMMENDED LANDSCAPE PLAN CONDITION BECAUSE THERE WAS AGREEMENT THAT THE APPLICANT DID NOT NEED TO MAKE THE PLAZA NEAR BUILDING D LARGER AND WITH THE STAFF-RECOMMENDED CONDITION #2, AS FOLLOWS: Additional Green Built techniques shall be incorporated into the project so it meets at least a 3-Star Green Built rating for the Site and Residential buildings. For the Office and Hotel buildings, a combination of Green Built and LEED techniques shall be used to achieve an equivalent of a 3-Star Green Built rating, using the Green Built Multi-Family Checklist. THE COMPOSITE LANDSCAPE PLAN L1.01 AS PRESENTED AT THIS MEETING WOULD BE THE PRIORITY LANDSCAPE PLAN. MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

The applicant reported that demolition of the site should begin in May.

APPROVAL

PRE060039 and L070080, Redmond Transit Center-Garage

Description: Three-level parking garage consisting of 108,000 square foot one ground level, two elevated levels containing approximately 380 parking stalls.

Location: NE 85th Street and 161st Ave NE

Applicant: Gerrie Jackson with King County

Prior Review Date(s): August 8, September 21, and December 7, 2006

Staff Contact: Gary Lee / 425.556.2418

Gary Lee, Senior Planner, presented the staff report, stating that for this sixth review staff recommends approval with conditions that the landscape plan be revised to include additional evergreen trees where no trees are currently shown along the east property line to provide additional understory visual buffering and to allow the drive aisle in the parking garage to be 24 feet wide with 8-foot, 6-inch-wide parking stalls.

Greg Harry, architect and project design for kpff, Consulting Engineers, 1601 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1600, Seattle, WA 98101, presented for the applicant. He distributed sheets that had changed slightly from the sets that were mailed out. For the north elevation, the Design Review Board preferred the 4a option, which had been incorporated into the project. He requested the DRB's input on the east side landscaping and path integration, wanting to know if a meandering path with less landscaping or a straight path with more landscaping would be preferred. He described the refinements to the design:

- Green screen element: They will be calling it the panel trellis element.
- Decorative panels along the north side perimeter will be a metal screening element hopefully low maintenance and something that would not rust.
- Metal alloyed lamps will be used on the upper deck.
- Increased the light candles from half to one on the upper deck. The Building Division is insisting on this. The planner will contact the Building Official about the issue of this being too bright for the residents of the neighboring TOD building.
- The electrical units may affect the depth of the display box. That will be resolved as the project moves forward.

Mr. Lee explained that the City's Transportation Division is requiring the path on the east side for safety reasons.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Madrid:

- Preferred more landscaping with a straight path.

Mr. Cope:

- Thought that the path being bark might be a conflict.
- Did not know that the four trees shown on the south side would survive construction. (Mr. Lee confirmed that the applicant would have to replace them if they did not survive.)
- Liked the density of the security screen more than the other two metal examples.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Insisted that there needed to be a landscape plan for that area because the landscaping there is currently a little thin. Must revisit a landscape plan for those areas shown as "existing." Would not accept what is shown as "existing." There are no new shrubs or new groundcover shown there, only along the eastern edge of the garage. That southern side needs something on that whole side and the eastern side where the path is. (Mr. Harry suggested that to add more landscape they might be able to push the path closer to the curb.)

Mr. Meade:

- Confirmed that the wooden fence would remain between the garage and the senior housing to mitigate headlights.

There was agreement that the applicant could work with staff on the landscape plan.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO APPROVE PRE060039 AND L070080, REDMOND TRANSIT CENTER GARAGE WITH CONDITIONS: (1) The Landscape Plan shall be revised to include additional evergreen trees (slow growing to 30 feet) where no trees are currently shown along the east property line in order to provide additional understory visual buffering along the east property line. (2) The deviations from the following standards are approved per the plans reviewed by the Design Review Board April 6, 2006 per RCDG 20C.40.40-03 Administrative Design Flexibility: (a) Allow drive aisle in the parking garage to be 24'-0" wide with an 8'-6"-wide parking stall, instead of a 25'-6" aisle. (3) Standard Presentation Materials Inconsistencies Condition. (4) The security screen will be used for the decorative panels in the vertical orientation screen.

MR. MEADE AMENDED THE MOTION TO INCLUDE EXPLORING INCREASING THE DEPTH OF THE DISPLAY BOX BY COMING TOWARD THE STREET SOMEWHERE FLUSH WITH THE EXTERIOR.

MOTION APPROVED (6-0).

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO CLOSE THE MEETING AT 9:10 P.M. MOTION CARRIED (6-0).

(Mr. Hall left at 9:15 PM.)

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE070016, CMU Cleveland

Description: Exterior alteration and structural upgrade to existing building

Location: 16390 Cleveland Street

Applicant: Josh Peterson with Magellan Architects

Staff Contact: Nathalie Schmidt / 425.556.2471

Nathalie Schmidt, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report for this proposed remodel to turn the storage building into a retail space. This is a legally nonconforming project in terms of parking

requirements, and no parking is required. She explained that the main purpose of this review was to discuss whether or not the materials and color palette were appropriate. At the time that applications for the building permit are submitted, the threshold would be determined. If that goes above 100%, there would be more requirements.

Pedro Castro, Magellan Architects, 8383 158th Ave NE, Redmond, WA 98052, gave an overview of what needs to happen to make the building usable for retail. He explained that the loading dock would be demolished. The materials would be stucco for the face, wood for the corner piece, corrugated metal to wrap around the parapet, and a flat metal canopy on the front of the building facing Cleveland Street. There would be a landscape planting strip between the building edge and the sidewalk along 164th Avenue NE.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

Ms. Velastegui:

- Felt uncomfortable about the west elevation. (Mr. Pedro said that there are usually cars parked in front of that elevation, which would mitigate the blankness. Josh Peterson, also with Magellan Architects, pointed out that there is a zero lot line.)
- Glad they had provided a drawing because this was never a historic building.
- Liked the corrugated metal.

(Ms. Velastegui left at 9:25 PM.)

Mr. Madrid:

- Thought it nice that the building was being renovated.
- Had some issues. Agreed that the west elevation was stark.
- Commented that the building does not have a base, just goes from ground up. Thought the building needed a base.
- Preferred architectural change to a color change.
- Confirmed that the wood was a staggered piece with a gap between. (Mr. Castro said he could send a picture of a building he saw in Texas using the same product.)
- Thought it was a good start but was not quite sure about the use of the metal. Thought he was okay with the metal.
- Wanted more explanation about the planting proposed on the east end. (Mr. Castro said he had tried to relieve the hardscape and make it warmer. Mr. Peterson said they had tried to provide a base and would like to find out if that would be possible. They pointed out that the building had the corrugated metal on it for years.)
- Confirmed that the garage door would be glazed storefront windows.

Mr. Cope:

- Asked if there was presently a tenant for the retail space.
- Was concerned about the desirability to tenants of the roll-up door although he liked it himself.
- Did not see a change in planes. (Mr. Peterson responded that the element on the corner will be on another plane, probably 2-6 inches. The wood would be more support than the metal.
- Said he would be interested to see how that 2-inch offset works out.)
- Could use a system of reveals on the west side to liven up that elevation. Could use color.
- Wanted to know how trash would be handled. (Mr. Castro explained that they would have to roll out garbage to the curb.) (Staff was not aware of another retail building in town that did that.)
- Agreed with Ms. Velastegui—liked that they included the drawing because the context of the building is far from historic.
- Liked the look and style of the building.

Mr. Meade:

- Did not think stucco was a good choice. The block itself is what the building is about. Suggested cleaning it up and painting it.
- Thought the galvanized metal would distract from that. Should paint.
- Thought the lpe wood siding would be phenomenal.

- Thought there was an opportunity on the west elevation to use some glass block up to the door inlets and maybe include lpe or keep same dimension and cut. Slide in steel to reinforce and add glass blocks.
- Create a rhythm with paint.
- Did not think this building needed a base.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Agreed that the west elevation must be improved.
- Loved the high-tech materials mixed in with the wood.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:45 PM. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY